

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	, FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/658,466	09/10/2003	Koichiro Shiraishi	242613US90 2205		
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 04/16/200 ON, PLLC	EXAMINER			
2100 PENNSY SUITE 800	LVANIA AVENUE, N	LAZORCIK, JASON L			
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1731		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/658,466	SHIRAISHI ET AL	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jason L. Lazorcik	1731	

·	Jason L. Lazorcik	•	1/31					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet	with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 03 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amen itice of Appeal (with appe	ndment, af eal fee) in	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire in	ater than SIX MONTHS from	n the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the correspond shortened statutory period for than three months after the	ing amount or reply orig	of the fee. The appropr jinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or searc			ecause				
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beauppeal; and/or	• •	aterially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number o	f finally re	iected claims.	•				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	•	,	,					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	• • • •	of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:		•					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a	separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:			ill be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections u	nder appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the clai	ims after e	entry is below or attacl	ned.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the ap	pplication i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s	s)	1 6					
13. Other:			STEVEN D CRISCI	N.				
	•	S	UPERVISORY PATENT EX TECHNOLOGY CENTER					
			oourourourouriell					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants presently ammended claims further limit the method of manufacturing a glass article by reciting that "only" lots with a minimum surface energy are further processed. This further limitation over previously claimed subject matter is deemed to introduce new issues that have not previously been considered and which require further search and consideration. Additionally, it is here noted that Applicants reliance upon the term "lot" appears to be an indefinite term. Specifically, since the instant specification provides no guidance or metric for the term, it is the Examiners prosition that a lot may be reasonably considered to range from a single unit of glass material to many multiples of glass material units.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments with respect to claims 1 and 2 have been fully considered but have been found unpersuasive.

First Applicant asserts that since Choi is directed to substrate cleaning for a silica bonding process, the Choi reference provides no teaching or suggestion that the claimed surface free energy would be useful in an optical glass process as taught by Fujino. However as set forth in the previous Office Action, Choi is clearly relied upon as a teaching which establishes a causal relationshiop between plasma cleaning and an observed substrate surface free energy. The reference further clearly established that silica (glass) substrates which display the claimed surface free energy are routinely achieved through oxygen plasma treatments. Now as also indicated in the prior action, Fujino teaches that oxygen plasma ashing is a preferred means for cleansing the glass preform prior to the press molding step. So as indicated on page 4 of the prior office action, although Fujino is silent regarding a requisite threshold surface free energy for substrate processing, it would have been obvoius to moniter and control such a value as a matter of routine process control for one of ordinary skill in the art.

Second, Applicant asserts that neither Choi nor Fujino teach processing of optical glass substrates in lots, however as indicated above Applicant has provided no guidance regarding the breadth and scope of intended coverage for the term a "lot". Absent any clealy defined terminology, it is understood by the Examiner that a lot may at the lower end comprise as few as a single unit while the upper end remains unbounded.